HONORABLE RONALD B. LEIGHTON 2 3 4 5 6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON 7 AT TACOMA 8 CASEY K CLINE, CASE NO. C17-5828 RBL 9 Plaintiff. ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR 10 LEAVE TO AMEND v. 11 SAFEWAY INC, et al., 12 Defendants. 13 14 THIS MATTER is before the Court on Plaintiff Cline's Motion to Amend his complaint. 15 [Dkt. # 16]. 16 The case involves a slip and fall at a Safeway store. Cline initially named as Doe 17 Defendants (1) an "Employee" who should have seen the spill that caused the accident, and the 18 "Manager" who had a duty to exercise reasonable care in supervising employees, including the 19 one who did not see or clean up the spilled soap that led to Cline's fall. Safeway removed the 20 case on diversity grounds. Cline sought remand, arguing that the employees were Washington 21 citizens. The Court denied the motion because the citizenship of Doe defendants is disregarded 22 for diversity purposes. It invited Cline to re-visit the issue when he identified the employee(s). 23 24

Cline now seeks to name as a defendant Karen Ballard, the "Manager" (she is actually the "Assistant Store Director") who assisted him after he fell.

Safeway argues that the deadline for adding parties passed February 1, and that Cline knew of Ballard's identity for a month before that. It argues that she is a "sham" defendant added only to destroy diversity, emphasizing that the only factual allegations against Ballard are that she was a manager, and she saw the soap when she helped Cline.

Leave to amend a complaint under Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a) "shall be freely given when justice so requires." *Carvalho v. Equifax Info. Services, LLC*, 629 F.3d 876, 892 (9th Cir. 2010) (citing *Forman v. Davis*, 371 U.S. 178, 182 (1962)). This policy is "to be applied with extreme liberality." *Eminence Capital, LLC v. Aspeon, Inc.*, 316 F.3d 1048, 1051 (9th Cir. 2003) (citations omitted). In determining whether to grant leave under Rule 15, courts consider five factors: "bad faith, undue delay, prejudice to the opposing party, futility of amendment, and whether the plaintiff has previously amended the complaint." *United States v. Corinthian Colleges*, 655 F.3d 984, 995 (9th Cir. 2011) (emphasis added). Among these factors, prejudice to the opposing party carries the greatest weight. *Eminence Capital*, 316 F.3d at 1052.

A proposed amendment is futile "if no set of facts can be proved under the amendment to the pleadings that would constitute a valid and sufficient claim or defense." *Gaskill v. Travelers Ins. Co.*, No. 11-cv-05847-RJB, 2012 WL 1605221, at *2 (W.D. Wash. May 8, 2012) (citing *Sweaney v. Ada County, Idaho*, 119 F.3d 1385, 1393 (9th Cir.1997)).

A non-diverse defendant that has been "fraudulently joined," may be ignored when the court determines the existence of diversity. *United Computer Systems, Inc. v. AT & T Corp.*, 298 F.3d 756, 761 (9th Cir. 2002) (citing *Morris v. Princess Cruises, Inc.*, 236 F.3d 1061, 1067 (9th Cir. 2001)).